DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 993 SP 015 384

AUTHOR Sander, Erika
TITLE Evaluation of Sex Integrated Physical Education Classes.
PUB DATE 3 Dec 79
NOTE 7p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Coeducation; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; *Physical Education; Secondary Education; *Sex Fairness; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Title IX Education Amendments of 1972

ABSTRACT

Implementation of Title IX and resultant sex equity laws in secondary physical education programs occasions a need to develop new methods of evaluating and grading students enrolled in coeducational physical education classes. This document discusses problems that may occur as a result of sex equity modifications from the point of view of the instructor who must grade a large and heterogeneous group of students in a fair and yet accurate manner. Several formats for student evaluation systems are presented. Discussion of the intent of sex equity rulings rather than the letter of such legislation is included. (LH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED180993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Erika Sander
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# EVALUATION OF SEX INTEGRATED PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASSES

Erika Sander, PhD, Associate Professor of Human Kinetics, UWM

Until most recently, very little professional effort has been directed toward developing a conceptual model and skills for evaluating students in coeducational secondary physical education. The implementation of Title IX in this area has occasioned the need to re-address evaluation, specifically grading.

Evaluation, the general construct. Along with research and program development, evaluation is one of three general problem solving models. Problems exist because barriers exist precluding the realization of a perceived intention (i.e., how can my one sex grading system work with sex integrated classes when boys and girls appear to be of differing skill and strength levels?). Evaluation aims at choosing/deciding/prioritizing two or more persons/positions. Sources of barriers to problem resolution include the political-legal (i.e., Title IX implementation), the historical (i.e., sex role stereotyping), the ethical-moral, and testing/evaluating issues (i.e., problem conceptualization, instrumentation, alternative explanations, etc.) (Gephart & Ingle, 1977).

Evaluation issues occasioned by Title IX. Sex equity law may be viewed from two perspectives - the "letter" (actual law, elimination of sex inequity, political-legal barriers per above) and the "intent" (the spirit of the law, elimination of sex bias, moral-ethical and historical barriers per above). Specifically, evaluation issues may be viewed in the following (AAHPER, Complying with Title IX, 1976):

1. Do course descriptions state the criteria for measurement of skills where these are used to group students?

2. Are criteria used for measurement of progress within a physical education course or program explicit and free of adverse effects upon students of one sex? (emphasis mine)

Evaluation issues - intent of the law. To deal with the intent of the law, physical educators must learn to proact (plan for change with intent of eliminating sex bias) rather than just react ( reacting to letter of law with minimum compliance).

SP 015 384

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The way in which we view the emerging role of the physically active girl/woman appears pertinent. Felshin (1974) indicates a three phase emergence of the woman sport participant: the "Apologetic" participates but apologizes for the involvement; the "Forensic" also participates but uses the letter of the law to create equitable participation; the "Dialectic" participates because of an identified and socially confirmed need to be involved in sport (often referred to as androgynous behavior, or behavior voided of sex role characteristics and addressed from the human perspective). As the intent of the law is addressed with respect to evaluation (grading), physical educators need to address their perception of girls/women in sport, realizing that in any class setting they may encounter "apologetics", "forensics", as well as "dialectics". Each mindset will react differently to grading schemes as they interface with sex inequity and bias.

Evaluation issues - available options for grading. Essentially, two basic evaluation strategies may be used to provide input for grading - formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation has a concern for the process of learning (on-going, class by class). Summative evaluation typically occurs at the beginning and end of units of instruction and reflects concern for level of achievement, classification of students, and prediction of future success of same (Safrit, 1973). Test format options are essentially fourfold: skill/performance, observational (rating scales, etc.), knowledge (written) and attitudinal (paper/pencil and interview).

General grading systems. Stamm (1979) has indicated that three basic grading systems are currently used which measure any or all of the following factors: participation, effort, achievement, preparation, and progress. The first system uses sex separate standards for grading (acknowledges that real differences may occur by sex; may also perpetuate differences that exist because of cultural/

social factors). The second system uses improvement scores with appropriate consideration given to skill level differences (i.e., the more skilled have less chance to improve than the less skilled). The third system uses mastery learning where each students' objectives are individually developed with realistic terminal goals (grades based on degree of mastery; also called "contract learning"). Interesting to note is that the first system uses a "group focus" as it relates groups of students by sex to grading schemes. The second and third systems emphasize a more "individual focus".

Evaluation issues - grouping. The Resource Center on Sex Equity (CCSSO, 1979) indicates that program foci and program options have direct impact on grading/evaluation schemes. The focus assumed by a physical education program may be one of the following: teachers' choice (each teacher does his/her own thing), sports centered-recreational emphasis (developing minimal level skill to recreate), sports centered-instructional emphasis (push students to their maximal level of excellence), fitness centered, sports and fitness centered, concept/values centered, combinations of any or all of above. Another has used a three fold analysis: "hit and giggle" (recreational modes), "Let's learn" (instructional, fitness modes), and "blood and guts" (competitive, excellence modes). Regardless of grouping mindset, grading schemes must be compatible with same. Program options also impact on grading. Options currently used include core (everyone takes same program), elective (students choose from available options), channeled elective (program has several channels with students electing from all channels), core/prescriptive (students are assigned specific sequences individually determined), combinations of any or all of above.

Evaluation issues - teaching style. Finally, teaching style may impact on evaluation procedures. Those assuming a large group focus (little individualization) typically use summative techniques. Those using large group and/or individualization teaching techniques use both summative and formative techniques.

Evaluation issues - creating change in grading systems. First, the physical educator must fully examine "what is", the currently employed system. Second, one must address "what can be" by examining grouping, program foci, and teaching style relative to evaluation techniques available. Third, "what will be" is determined by relating the first two steps to the professional/philosophical aspects unique to the department and its members. Finally, the department and its physical educators implement and continually evaluate the effectiveness of the determined grading system. Effectiveness of grading systems depends on the ability of a department to react and proact where sex equity issues are evident.

Evaluation issues - specific grading systems. Essentially, four general grading formats may be assumed by departments of physical education. Sex equity implications are also presented.

One Department Grading System. Department members mutually agree on all facets of evaluation. The sex equity implications are as follows: assumes all students begin in the same place; is subject to individual staff interpretation; measurement is not regulated; and does not allow for individual focus, which may reflect negatively on females who start out behind males.

Competency-Based Grading System. Competencies for various units are predetermined. Instruction is directed toward the development of these competencies. Evaluation is on student progress or retention of high skill/cognition ability. The sex equity implications are as follows: very conducive to individualized instruction and subject to individual staff interpretation in administration of tests.

Academic Freedom Grading System. Staff members are allowed to establish their own evaluation criteria for the units they teach. Sex equity implications are as follows: allows a great deal of staff latitude and does not provide for program consistency.

Combinations of Grading Systems. Departments have one set of policies

for all basic instructional units (core), allow academic freedom for special courses (cross-age teaching, life saving, performing dance, etc.), establishing competency-based criteria for electives, etc. Sex equity implications are as follows: more difficult to organize and allows flexibility for staff.

Summary. A simple solution for developing sound grading/evaluation practices in coeducational secondary physical education does not exist. Each professional physical educator must address grading issues and implications for sex equity by examining the following:

1. What is? Know the law; know the distinction between sex equity and sex bias; examine personal values relative to the intent and letter of the law; know what the actual sex differences are (physically, physiologically) and what the cultural sex differences are; relate these factors to the existing grading system and grouping/teaching style/program foci factors.

2. What can be? Develop options to "what is" that reflect efforts at law compliance (sex equity) and the elimination of sex bias; consider re-organizing curriculum and delivery style with respect to grouping and program foci factors; select appropriate grading system to best measure program objectives.

3. What will be? Decide and do! Remember to, in an on-going fashion, continue to re-evaluate grading systems (annually at the least). Remember that you and students/parents/other colleagues may be able to provide input!

References follow.
3 December 1979

EVALUATION OF SEX INTEGRATED PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASSES

REFERENCES

AAHPERD (1976). Title IX: sex integrated programs that work. AAHPERD: Washington, D.C.

AAHPERD(1976). Complying with Title IX. AAHPERD: Washington, D.C.

CCSSO (Resource Center on Sex Equity) (1979). Providing training and technical assistance services for achieving sex equity. Washington, D.C.: RCSE.

CCSSO (Resource Center on Sex Equity) (1979). Implementing Title IX and attaining sex equity: a workshop package for elementary-secondary educators. Washington, D.C.: RCSE.

CCSSO (Resource Center on Sex Equity) (1979). Implementing Title IX in physical education and athletics: application booklet for physical activity specialists. Washington, D.C.: RCSE.

(Note that the three CCSSO publications are available from Superintendent of Documents, U,S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402)

Felshin, Jan (1974). The triple option: for women in sport. Quest 21:36-40.

Ingle, Robert and William Gephart (1977). Toward a taxonomy of empirically-based problem-solving strategies. NSPER Notes 1:1-3.

Rosenthal, R. and L. Jacobson (1963). Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rohrbaugh, Joanna B. (1979). Feminity on the line. Psychology Today. August 1979, pp. 30-42.

Safrit, M. Joanne (1973). Evaluation in physical education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Stamm, Carole L. (1979). Evaluation of coeducational physical activity classes. JOPER, January 1979, pp. 68-69.